



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/594,556

09/24/2007

Alexander Golitschek Edler Von Elbwart

L7725.06124

5571

52989

7590

10/12/2010

Dickinson Wright PLLC

James E. Ledbetter, Esq.

International Square

1875 Eye Street, N.W., Suite 1200

Washington, DC 20006

EXAMINER

D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/12/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/594,556	GOLITSCHKE EDLER VON ELBWART ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen M. D'Agosta	2617	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 04 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☒ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
- The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 18,22-30 and 34.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Stephen M. D'Agosta/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Continuation of 3. NOTE: claim 22 adds new limitations that were not previously found in the claim, hence a new search is required.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. The examiner must give each claim the broadest, most reasonable interpretation and he notes that the claims merely determining a minimum allocation/bandwidth, scheduling the allocation/bandwidth and providing the allocation/bandwidth, which broadly reads on multiplexing and quality of service.

2. Holtzman broadly teaches the request and assignment of communication bandwidth between a mobile device and network. The "allocation units" (or bandwidth/timeslots) are identified and scheduled/assigned for use by the "scheduler". Holtzman teaches assigning an initialized data rate while Havinga teaches a MAC protocol scheduling function to support many types of traffic while Klein/Hoagland teach actual requests for resource parameters/data rates. Hence the combination reads on the (broadly written) claims.

3. The applicant argues that the communication unit does not request the resource allocation. Holtzman does not (eg. the network assumes what is needed) and the secondary art Klein/Hoagland teach various embodiments where the mobile unit requests data allocation/bandwidth. Hence the prior art teach that the bandwidth allocated can be assigned/requested by either the network or the mobile unit. Note that this "design choice" is well known and many other functions can be performed on either "side", eg. location determination, power control, handoff to name a few. In each case, either the mobile or the network provides much/all of the control -- hence the applicant's design is similar in fashion and rejected by the prior art.

>> Furthermore, the applicant is attacking the references individually and does not appear to combine the other references which cure Holtzman's deficiency (eg. the mobile can request resources/bandwidth).

4. A new search is required since the applicant has modified claim 22 with new limitations, eg. the minimum resource parameter is now directly related to the information bits "processed by the communication unit in the scheduling frame" which was not claimed before, eg. there was no direct correlation between the resource parameter and the scheduling frame.